

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/554,793	09/19/2000	Volker Zimmer	RDID0043US	1444
32842	7590 09/27/2005		EXAMINER	
THE LAW	OFFICE OF JILL L. V	ALEXANDER, LYLE		
128 SHORE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OGDEN DUNES, IN 46368			1743	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan	09/554,793	ZIMMER, VOLKER			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication of	Lyle A. Alexander	1743			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sneet with th	e correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply b d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f tote, cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14.	April 2005.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-5,7 and 9-34 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdres 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-5,7 and 9-34 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applic ority documents have been rece au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai  5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/554,793

Art Unit: 1743

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-5,7 and 9-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The new claims language "such that the detection element is downstream of the cover" is vague and indefinite as to the actual position of the cover. The language does not exclude the cover from also being upstream. If the cover can be both upstream and down stream, it appears the structure could be read on any cover. It seems that Applicant might be intended a specific structure that is only downstream of the detection element.

#### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 09/554,793 Page 3

Art Unit: 1743

Claims 2-5,7 and 9-34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,592,815. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both are directed to a device and method of use comprising a first layer, a detection layer and a cover having a notch to apply the sample. The cover layer is both upstream and downstream from the detection zone and has been properly read on it.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 4-5,9-14,16-18,21-22,24-27,30-31,33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Douglas et al. (USP 5,843,691) or Zimmer (USP 5,814,522).

See the appropriate paragraph of the 6/23/04 Office action.

With respect to the new claim language directed to "such that the detection element is downstream of the cover", the Office maintains Douglas et al. teach a cover that extends both upstream and downstream form the detection element.

Zimmer teach in fig.(3) a cover(8) this is downstream from the reagent(6).

Capillary gap(11) has been read on the claimed notch. Alternatively, Fig. (4) teaches cover(8) downstream from reagent(6/7) and gap(11) that has been read on the claimed notch.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 09/554,793

Art Unit: 1743

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 2,3,19,20,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas or Zimmer (USP 5,814,522) either in view of Columbus, Hodges or Lija.

See the appropriate paragraph of the 6/23/04 Office action.

Zimmer is being applied in the identical manner as Douglas.

Claims 7,15,23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douglas or Zimmer (USP 5,814,522) either in view of Hodges and together further in view of Heller.

See the appropriate paragraph of the 6/23/04 Office action.

Zimmer is being applied in the identical manner as Douglas.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/14/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' state Douglas et al. fail to teach a first and second edge. The Office maintains Douglas et al. do teach first and second edged on the cover as the taught cover is a 3-dimensional object and must have a first and second edge.

Applicants state the instant claims are directed to a sample hole(30) the is spaced from an end of the bottom layer(26). These remarks are not commensurate in scope with the pending claims that are not limited to these structures.

Application/Control Number: 09/554,793

Art Unit: 1743

Applicants state Douglas fails to teach "a carrier.... to the at least one notch is exposed". The Office maintains Douglas and Zimmer both meet these limitations.

Applicants state the art fails to teach the limitations of claims 16, 17 and 26. The Office maintains these limitations are sufficiently broad to have been properly read on Douglas and Zimmer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lyle A Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

4

\*\*: